

From Clinical Error to Criminal Liability: A Medico-Legal Framework for Healthcare Accountability

Prof. Dr. Willie Sai Ho Chan, LLB, MD, FRSM, FRAMI

Fellow, Professor, and National Representative, European Association for Predictive, Preventive and Personalised Medicine (EPMA), Taiwan, China.

Abstract

Background: Healthcare-related harm may result from unavoidable complications, clinical error, negligence, professional misconduct, system failure, or intentional wrongdoing. These categories are frequently conflated, creating uncertainty for patients, healthcare professionals, regulators, courts, and healthcare institutions.

Objective: This article develops a medico-legal framework for distinguishing clinical error, negligence, professional misconduct, civil malpractice, and criminal healthcare conduct.

Analysis: The article integrates legal, medical, ethical, and patient-safety perspectives. It examines the standard of care, informed consent, causation, professional competence, institutional responsibility, regulatory discipline, and the threshold for criminal liability. It argues that malpractice should not automatically be classified as a criminal offense, while intentional, reckless, fraudulent, grossly negligent, or otherwise unlawful conduct should remain subject to appropriate legal procedures.

Conclusion: Healthcare accountability should be proportionate to the nature of the conduct, the degree of preventability, the harm caused, and the applicable legal standard. A balanced framework can protect patients, provide fair remedies, preserve due process for professionals, and promote learning from preventable harm.

Keywords: Medical Malpractice; Medical Law; Clinical Error; Clinical Negligence; Criminal Liability; Patient Safety; Professional Misconduct; Healthcare Accountability; Personalized Medicine.

INTRODUCTION

Healthcare is an essential human activity, but it is also complex, uncertain, and vulnerable to error. Diagnosis and treatment frequently occur under conditions of incomplete information, time pressure, changing clinical circumstances, and individual patient variation. Even when healthcare professionals act competently and in good faith, patients may experience complications, deterioration, disability, or death.

An adverse outcome does not automatically establish negligence, malpractice, or criminal conduct. The outcome may reflect the natural progression of disease, a recognized complication, an unavoidable risk, a limitation of available medical knowledge, an individual error, a system failure, professional negligence, or intentional wrongdoing. These possibilities must be distinguished carefully.

The concept of medical malpractice is used in clinical, legal, regulatory, and public discussions, but its meaning may vary among jurisdictions. In general, a malpractice claim concerns alleged professional negligence that causes harm,

but the precise legal elements depend on the applicable law. Legal analysis must therefore identify the jurisdiction, the relevant professional standard, the evidence required, and the available remedies.

The automatic criminalization of every serious clinical error would be inappropriate. It may discourage healthcare professionals from reporting incidents, participating openly in investigations, and sharing information needed for patient-safety improvement. It may also encourage defensive medicine and obscure the difference between an unfortunate outcome and culpable conduct.

At the same time, a patient-safety culture must not become a shield for intentional harm, recklessness, gross negligence, fraud, abuse, concealment, falsification of records, or repeated serious violations of professional duties. Patient protection requires transparency, effective investigation, proportionate accountability, and appropriate legal remedies.

The World Health Organization's Global Patient Safety Action Plan 2021–2030 emphasizes the elimination of avoidable

Citation: Prof. Willie Sai Ho Chan, "From Clinical Error to Criminal Liability: A Medico-Legal Framework for Healthcare Accountability", OAS Journal of Medical and Health Sciences, 2026; 1(1): 70-77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70315/oas.oasjmh.2026.0101010>.

harm and the development of safer health systems through coordinated policy and clinical action.

These objectives require accountability systems that promote learning while responding appropriately to serious professional wrongdoing.

This article examines healthcare accountability at the intersection of law and medicine. It asks:

How can legal and medical knowledge be integrated to create a fair accountability framework that protects patients, promotes patient safety, and distinguishes clinical error from negligence, professional misconduct, and criminal conduct?

The article also considers the contribution of preventive, predictive, and personalized medicine to the reduction of avoidable harm and to the responsible governance of emerging healthcare technologies.

CONCEPTUAL DEFINITIONS

Adverse Clinical Outcome

An adverse clinical outcome is an undesirable result associated with disease or healthcare. It may include injury, disability, deterioration, prolonged hospitalization, treatment complication, or death.

An adverse outcome alone does not establish that a healthcare professional acted improperly. A patient may experience a known complication even where the treatment was appropriate and the relevant risks were disclosed.

Patient-Safety Incident

A patient-safety incident is an event or circumstance that could have resulted, or did result, in unnecessary harm to a patient. The World Health Organization distinguishes patient-safety incidents from errors and recognizes that incidents may arise from clinical actions, omissions, systems, or other circumstances.

The purpose of identifying a patient-safety incident is not necessarily to assign blame. It is often to understand what happened, identify contributing factors, and prevent recurrence.

Clinical Error

An error may be understood as the failure of a planned action to be completed as intended or the use of an incorrect plan to achieve an objective.

Clinical errors may be diagnostic, therapeutic, technical, communication-related, administrative, or organizational. They may occur despite good faith and reasonable professional effort. An error may be preventable, but preventability must be assessed in light of the information, resources, workload, and circumstances existing at the time.

Negligence

Negligence generally involves a failure to meet the legally applicable standard of care, together with legally sufficient

causation and harm. The precise elements differ among jurisdictions.

A negligent act is not necessarily intentional. It may involve an unreasonable act or omission, inadequate assessment, failure to follow an appropriate procedure, insufficient monitoring, poor communication, or failure to respond to a foreseeable risk.

Medical Malpractice

Medical malpractice is a legal concept generally associated with professional negligence causing harm to a patient. It may be pursued through civil litigation, professional disciplinary proceedings, or other legal mechanisms depending on the jurisdiction.

The term should not be used as though every malpractice allegation is automatically criminal. Civil malpractice, professional misconduct, and criminal liability are separate categories, although the same factual event may give rise to more than one form of proceeding.

A recent discussion in the Hong Kong Medical Journal similarly emphasizes that genuine clinical errors and mistakes do not necessarily amount to criminal negligence and that criminal sanctions should be reserved for conduct meeting an appropriate culpability threshold.

Professional Misconduct

Professional misconduct involves conduct that violates professional, ethical, licensing, or regulatory requirements. Examples may include serious dishonesty, abuse of patients, breach of confidentiality, improper relationships, unsafe practice, falsification of records, or repeated failure to comply with professional standards.

Professional misconduct may justify regulatory action even when the conduct does not satisfy the elements of a civil claim or criminal offense.

Criminal Healthcare Conduct

Criminal healthcare conduct exists when the facts satisfy the elements of a criminal offense under the applicable law. Depending on the jurisdiction, relevant conduct may include intentional harm, reckless disregard for life or safety, gross negligence, fraud, unlawful treatment, abuse, bribery, concealment, or falsification of records.

Criminal liability should not be inferred merely because a patient experienced harm or because a clinical decision had an unfavorable result.

THE MEDICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Standard of Care

The medical assessment of a malpractice allegation begins with the clinical circumstances. Relevant questions include:

What was the patient's condition?

What information was available at the time?

What alternatives were reasonably available?

What risks were foreseeable?

What would a reasonably competent professional have done?

Were appropriate investigations, treatment, monitoring, and follow-up provided?

The standard of care should not be assessed exclusively through hindsight. Clinical decisions should be examined according to the information reasonably available when the decision was made, while recognizing that subsequent events may reveal risks that were not apparent at the time.

A legal assessment also requires attention to the professional's actual role and resources. The standard expected of a specialist, general practitioner, trainee, emergency clinician, pharmacist, nurse, or healthcare institution may involve different responsibilities, although all remain subject to applicable professional and legal duties.

Diagnostic Uncertainty

Diagnosis is frequently probabilistic rather than certain. Symptoms may be atypical, diseases may be rare, investigations may be inconclusive, and several conditions may produce similar clinical findings.

A missed or delayed diagnosis may therefore result from unavoidable uncertainty, understandable error, inadequate investigation, negligence, communication failure, or system delay. Determining the appropriate category requires analysis of the clinical facts rather than reliance on the outcome alone.

Clinicians should be encouraged to recognize uncertainty, seek assistance, arrange appropriate follow-up, and communicate warning signs to patients. Failure to address a known or reasonably foreseeable risk may be more significant than the mere fact that the initial diagnosis was incorrect.

Treatment Risk

Many treatments carry known risks. Surgery, medication, anesthesia, invasive procedures, radiation, and other interventions may cause complications even when performed appropriately.

A complication does not automatically constitute malpractice. The relevant issues include whether the treatment was indicated, whether reasonable alternatives were considered, whether material risks were explained, whether the procedure was performed competently, and whether the patient was appropriately monitored.

The risk-benefit assessment may differ among patients. A treatment that is appropriate for one person may be unsuitable for another because of age, comorbidity, genetic factors, drug interactions, pregnancy, frailty, or patient preferences.

Informed Consent

Informed consent is both a clinical and legal process. It requires meaningful communication about the proposed intervention, material risks, reasonable alternatives, expected benefits, and the consequences of refusing treatment.

Consent should be adapted to the patient's language, health literacy, cognitive capacity, disability, cultural context, and clinical condition. Documentation is important, but a signed form should not replace genuine communication and patient understanding.

Emergency circumstances may affect the consent process, but they do not eliminate the duty to act within professional and legal limits. When a patient lacks decision-making capacity, the relevant legal framework for substitute decision-making or best-interest treatment should be followed.

Professional Competence

Professional competence includes knowledge, technical skills, clinical judgment, communication, documentation, teamwork, supervision, and recognition of personal limitations.

A healthcare professional may act negligently by undertaking a procedure without appropriate training, failing to seek assistance, ignoring a clear warning sign, or continuing unsafe practice despite known limitations. Conversely, a professional should not be judged negligent merely because a reasonable clinical decision produced an unfavorable result.

Continuing professional development and effective supervision are therefore important components of malpractice prevention. Institutions should ensure that professionals are appropriately credentialed and supported for the services they provide.

Communication and Documentation

Communication failures are an important source of preventable harm. Problems may occur during referral, handover, discharge, medication reconciliation, interpretation of test results, or communication with patients and families.

Accurate documentation supports continuity of care and later review. However, documentation should reflect the clinical reality rather than be created retrospectively to defend a decision. Falsification or deliberate concealment may have serious professional and legal consequences.

Communication after an adverse event should be honest, respectful, and appropriately coordinated. Patients and families should not be left to discover serious information through incomplete records, informal discussion, or media reports.

System Contributors

Clinical incidents may be influenced by factors beyond the individual professional. These may include inadequate staffing, excessive workload, fatigue, weak supervision, poor

equipment, unavailable medications, delayed test results, fragmented records, unclear protocols, insufficient training, and ineffective escalation procedures.

A fair investigation should therefore examine the interaction between individual decisions and institutional conditions. Focusing exclusively on one clinician may fail to identify the underlying causes of harm.

The World Health Organization's patient-safety framework supports the development of high-reliability health systems, safe clinical processes, patient and family engagement, and education and protection of health workers.

THE LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

Duty of Care

The first legal question is whether a healthcare professional or institution owed a recognized duty to the patient. The duty may arise from the professional-patient relationship, employment, hospital admission, emergency treatment, statutory obligations, or other legal circumstances.

Hospitals and healthcare organizations may also owe duties concerning staffing, supervision, equipment, credentialing, infection control, record systems, and clinical governance.

The existence and scope of duty must be assessed according to the relevant law. This article therefore does not assume that one country's legal terminology or liability test applies universally.

Breach of Duty

Breach involves failure to meet the applicable legal standard. The assessment may consider professional guidance, accepted clinical practice, expert evidence, institutional policies, available resources, the urgency of the situation, and the patient's specific condition.

A professional guideline may be relevant evidence, but it should not always be treated as an inflexible legal rule. Clinical judgment may reasonably depart from a guideline where the circumstances justify doing so and the decision is properly considered and documented.

The legal question is not necessarily whether another clinician would have chosen a different course. It is whether the conduct fell below the applicable standard in a legally significant way.

Causation

A claimant may need to establish that the alleged act or omission caused the relevant harm. Causation may be difficult where the patient had serious pre-existing disease, multiple risk factors, several treating professionals, or an outcome that might have occurred even with appropriate care.

The fact that harm followed treatment does not prove that treatment caused the harm. Both medical evidence and legal principles must be applied carefully.

Causation may also involve loss of opportunity, delayed

diagnosis, failure to warn, or increased risk, depending on the legal system. The article should address these issues only with jurisdiction-specific authority.

Harm and Remedies

Harm may include physical injury, psychological injury, disability, loss of function, additional treatment, financial loss, reduced life expectancy, or death. The legal remedies available may include compensation, treatment costs, rehabilitation, or other relief.

Civil proceedings are primarily concerned with legal responsibility and remedies. They do not necessarily determine whether a professional should be criminally prosecuted or disciplined by a regulator.

Patients may also require non-financial remedies, including explanation, apology, correction of records, access to continuing care, and assurance that lessons have been learned.

Professional Discipline

Regulatory and disciplinary proceedings focus on public protection, professional competence, ethics, and fitness to practise. A regulator may investigate conduct that does not result in civil damages and may impose conditions, warnings, suspension, or removal from practice according to the relevant law.

Professional discipline should be evidence-based and proportionate. It should protect patients while preserving procedural fairness for the professional involved.

Regulatory bodies should also distinguish isolated human error from repeated unsafe conduct, dishonesty, abuse, deliberate non-compliance, or failure to remediate known deficiencies.

Criminal Liability

Criminal liability is different from civil malpractice and professional discipline. It requires proof that the conduct satisfies the elements of a defined criminal offense, including any required mental state and causal connection.

The seriousness of the outcome does not alone determine criminality. A death or severe injury may result from an unavoidable complication, an error without criminal culpability, negligence, gross negligence, recklessness, or intentional harm. These categories require different factual and legal analysis.

The appropriate principle is:

Medical malpractice is not inherently or automatically criminal; criminal liability depends on the conduct, the evidence, and the applicable criminal law.

Criminal law should generally be reserved for conduct that demonstrates a level of culpability sufficient to justify the use of the state's strongest punitive powers. The precise threshold must be determined under the applicable jurisdiction.

ETHICAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Non-Maleficence and Beneficence

Healthcare professionals have ethical duties to avoid preventable harm and promote patient welfare. These duties require appropriate assessment, treatment, monitoring, communication, and follow-up.

Ethical responsibility does not mean that professionals can guarantee successful outcomes. It means that they should act with reasonable competence, care, honesty, and respect for the patient.

Autonomy

Patients have the right to participate in decisions about their care, subject to applicable law and capacity requirements. Respect for autonomy requires information that is understandable, relevant, and sufficiently complete for meaningful decision-making.

Failure to obtain valid consent may raise ethical, civil, regulatory, and sometimes criminal issues, depending on the circumstances and jurisdiction.

Justice

Justice requires fair treatment of both patients and healthcare professionals. Patients who suffer preventable harm should have access to explanation, investigation, support, and appropriate remedies.

Professionals should not be punished solely because the outcome was poor or because public pressure demands a visible individual to blame. Fairness requires reliable evidence, independent assessment, and due process.

Transparency and Duty of Candour

When a serious incident occurs, patients and families should receive timely and honest communication. Concealing mistakes may worsen harm, undermine trust, and create additional ethical and legal concerns.

Transparency should be accompanied by respect for confidentiality, careful communication, and avoidance of premature conclusions before the facts have been properly established.

Accountability and Learning

Accountability should not be understood only as punishment. It also includes explanation, correction, prevention, compensation, professional improvement, institutional reform, and public protection.

A learning system should identify why an incident occurred and whether similar incidents could happen again. It should distinguish blameworthy conduct from system vulnerability and address each appropriately.

INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Healthcare is delivered through teams, organizations, technologies, and regulatory systems. The individual

clinician is important, but the clinician may not be the only responsible actor.

Institutions may contribute to harm through inadequate staffing, insufficient supervision, poor credentialing, unsafe workloads, defective equipment, fragmented records, unavailable protocols, delayed investigations, weak infection control, or failure to respond to previous warnings.

This does not eliminate individual responsibility where a professional acts negligently, recklessly, fraudulently, abusively, or intentionally. It does mean that investigations should examine the complete chain of events.

A comprehensive investigation should ask:

What happened?

What information was available at the time?

Which decisions and omissions contributed to the event?

Were organizational barriers present?

Was the conduct inadvertent or culpable?

Did the institution have reasonable safety systems?

What response would be proportionate?

How can recurrence be prevented?

Institutional accountability may include internal review, regulatory inspection, corrective action, compensation, governance reform, and reporting to relevant authorities. Where intentional or seriously reckless conduct is suspected, legal investigation may also be appropriate.

A PROPORTIONATE ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK

A proportionate framework should begin by distinguishing an unavoidable outcome from preventable harm.

An unavoidable complication or non-preventable outcome should be addressed through clear explanation, appropriate treatment, documentation, and support for the patient and family. The absence of negligence does not remove the professional duty to communicate compassionately.

An unintentional clinical error should prompt disclosure, review, education, and system improvement. The error should be assessed to determine whether it arose from individual action, system design, communication failure, workload, inadequate training, or several interacting factors.

Established negligence causing harm may justify civil liability, professional review, corrective action, and compensation where the legal requirements are satisfied. The assessment should focus on the applicable standard of care, causation, evidence, and the circumstances existing at the relevant time.

Professional misconduct or repeated unsafe practice may require regulatory investigation. Sanctions should protect the public and be proportionate to the seriousness, persistence, and preventability of the conduct.

Intentional, fraudulent, abusive, reckless, grossly negligent, or otherwise unlawful conduct may justify criminal investigation, depending on the applicable law. Criminal proceedings should be based on evidence of a legally defined offense and should not be initiated solely because the clinical outcome was serious.

This framework is analytical rather than a substitute for national law. Its purpose is to improve clarity and proportionality in the assessment of healthcare responsibility.

RELEVANCE TO PREVENTIVE, PREDICTIVE, AND PERSONALIZED MEDICINE

Preventive Medicine

Preventive medicine can reduce avoidable harm through vaccination, screening, early intervention, infection prevention, risk-factor management, patient education, medication review, clinical audit, and safety protocols.

Prevention is also relevant to malpractice because healthcare systems should not wait for repeated harm before correcting known risks. Institutions have an ethical and governance responsibility to learn from near misses and early warning signals.

Predictive Medicine

Predictive medicine may identify patients at increased risk of deterioration, medication complications, readmission, adverse drug reactions, or treatment failure. These tools may help professionals prioritize monitoring and intervention.

Predictive systems also create risks. They may produce false positives, false negatives, biased outputs, data errors, or recommendations that are difficult to interpret. Responsibility must therefore remain clear when a predictive tool is used, ignored, misunderstood, or implemented without adequate validation.

Personalized Medicine

Personalized medicine adapts care to the patient's characteristics, including comorbidities, pharmacogenomic factors, clinical history, preferences, and risk profile.

Individualized care can improve safety, but it requires accurate data, informed consent, privacy protection, professional competence, and appropriate interpretation. A personalized recommendation should not be treated as automatically correct simply because it is technologically sophisticated.

Artificial Intelligence and Clinical Decision Support

Artificial intelligence may assist with diagnosis, risk prediction, treatment selection, imaging, documentation, and monitoring. However, the use of AI does not eliminate human responsibility.

When AI contributes to a clinical decision, accountability should examine the quality of the data, validation of the system, appropriateness of deployment, human oversight,

professional interpretation, institutional governance, and communication with the patient.

Healthcare organizations should establish clear procedures for monitoring algorithmic performance, identifying bias, documenting human review, managing system failure, and investigating AI-associated incidents.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Healthcare systems should adopt clear definitions distinguishing adverse outcomes, patient-safety incidents, clinical errors, negligence, malpractice, professional misconduct, and criminal conduct.

Good-faith reporting of clinical incidents and near misses should be protected, while protections should not extend to intentional concealment, fraud, abuse, falsification, or reckless disregard for patient safety.

Serious incidents should be reviewed independently and promptly. Investigations should consider individual actions, team communication, institutional systems, staffing, supervision, technology, workload, and available resources.

Patients and families should receive honest, timely, and compassionate information. They should have access to appropriate clinical support, complaint mechanisms, investigation, and legal remedies where applicable.

Healthcare professionals should receive education in medical law, informed consent, documentation, communication, ethics, patient safety, and the responsible use of artificial intelligence.

Institutions should strengthen clinical governance through audit, credentialing, supervision, continuing education, incident learning, safe staffing, fatigue management, and effective escalation procedures.

Regulators and courts should distinguish poor outcomes from legally culpable conduct. The seriousness of harm should be considered, but it should not replace analysis of duty, breach, causation, evidence, and the applicable mental state.

Criminal prosecution should be reserved for conduct that satisfies the requirements of the relevant criminal law. Civil, regulatory, institutional, and restorative responses may be more appropriate for other forms of harm.

Research should examine how different jurisdictions define and respond to medical malpractice. Comparative work should also examine patient outcomes, professional reporting, disciplinary procedures, criminal thresholds, compensation systems, and the effect of legal reform.

DISCUSSION

The central challenge is to avoid two opposite mistakes. The first is to treat every poor clinical outcome as proof of malpractice or criminality. The second is to use patient safety as a justification for avoiding accountability for negligent, reckless, fraudulent, abusive, or intentional conduct.

A fair system must be compassionate toward patients and fair to professionals. Patients need explanation, recognition, treatment, compensation where legally appropriate, and protection against recurrence. Healthcare professionals need clear standards, competent investigation, due process, and an environment in which good-faith reporting supports improvement rather than automatic punishment.

The distinction between error and culpable conduct is particularly important. An unintentional error made while following reasonable procedures should not automatically be treated in the same way as knowingly unsafe practice or deliberate concealment. Similarly, system failure should not automatically eliminate individual responsibility when a professional has acted with recklessness, fraud, abuse, or intentional disregard for safety.

Law and medicine should therefore operate together. Medical expertise helps explain the clinical event. Legal analysis determines whether the conduct satisfies the elements of liability or crime. Ethics guides fairness and transparency. Patient-safety science identifies how recurrence can be prevented.

The use of predictive and personalized technologies makes this integration even more important. As decision-making becomes increasingly supported by algorithms, genomic information, electronic records, and clinical data, responsibility must remain understandable to patients and professionals. Innovation should improve care rather than create uncertainty about who is accountable when harm occurs.

The article's central position is not that healthcare professionals should be immune from criminal law. Rather, criminal law should be applied carefully and proportionately. A brief lapse, inadvertent error, or reasonable clinical judgment should not automatically be equated with criminal culpability. Conduct involving awareness of risk, a conscious choice to disregard that risk, and a meaningful opportunity to act differently may require more serious consideration, subject to the applicable legal standard.

LIMITATIONS

This article presents a conceptual medico-legal framework rather than a jurisdiction-specific legal opinion or empirical analysis of malpractice claims. The definitions of negligence, malpractice, professional misconduct, and criminal liability vary among legal systems.

The article does not attempt to determine the law of every country. Its recommendations should therefore be adapted to the legislation, case law, regulatory framework, and professional standards of the jurisdiction under examination.

A future systematic review could evaluate malpractice cases, disciplinary decisions, legislation, patient-safety reports, and professional guidance across selected jurisdictions. Such a review should specify its databases, search strategy,

eligibility criteria, screening process, quality assessment, and synthesis methods. PRISMA 2020 provides reporting guidance for systematic reviews, including transparent explanation of why the review was conducted, how evidence was identified and selected, and what was found.

CONCLUSION

Medical malpractice should not automatically be classified as a criminal offense. An adverse clinical outcome, an unintentional error, negligence, professional misconduct, civil malpractice, and criminal conduct are distinct categories requiring different forms of assessment and response.

A proportionate medico-legal framework should protect patients, provide appropriate remedies, preserve professional fairness, recognize institutional responsibility, and encourage learning from preventable harm.

Criminal liability should be considered only when the conduct satisfies the elements of a legally defined criminal offense. Intentional, fraudulent, abusive, reckless, grossly negligent, or otherwise unlawful conduct must remain subject to appropriate investigation and action.

Preventive, predictive, and personalized medicine can strengthen patient safety by identifying risk earlier, supporting individualized decision-making, and improving clinical governance. These benefits will depend on transparency, data quality, privacy protection, professional competence, human oversight, and clear allocation of responsibility.

The appropriate goal is neither automatic punishment nor absence of accountability. It is a fair, evidence-based, patient-centred system in which responsibility is proportionate to conduct, harm, preventability, and law.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Global Patient Safety Action Plan 2021–2030: Towards Eliminating Avoidable Harm in Health Care. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
2. World Health Organization. Conceptual Framework for the International Classification for Patient Safety. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2009/2010.
3. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals. Updated guidance.
4. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71.
5. Chan J, et al. Clinical errors and mistakes: civil or criminal liability? *Hong Kong Med J*. 2025;31(1):9–11.
6. Kazarian M. Criminalising Medical Malpractice: A Comparative Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2022.

This is a complete narrative article draft without tables. Before submission, you should replace the bracketed author details, select the jurisdictions to be analyzed, verify every legal proposition against primary sources, and conform the references and declarations to the target journal's instructions. ICMJE guidance recommends accurate, directly relevant references and verification against original or reliable bibliographic sources.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Prof. Willie Sai Ho Chan, LLB, MD, FRSM, FRAMI is an interdisciplinary scholar and clinician from Hong Kong, China. He earned his LLB from the China University of Political Science and Law in Beijing and his MD from China Medical University in Taiwan, reflecting a distinguished blend of medical, legal, and scientific training. He serves as Fellow, Professor, and National Representative of the European Association for Predictive, Preventive and Personalised Medicine (EPMA, Brussels, Belgium) in Taiwan, China. His work spans Chinese and Western medicine, genetics, forensic science, DNA research, aerospace engineering, and forensic hypnosis. Prof. Chan has contributed widely to healthcare and medicine through publications, lectures, and editorial work. His selected publications include Taiwan's Healthcare Report 2010, The Blueprint of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Then and Now: Regenerative Medicine, Uncover the Hidden Message in DNA, and A New Hope: Regenerative Medicine.